

RFP #

## PROPOSAL EVALUATION WORKSHEET

Vendor: \_\_\_\_\_ Date of Evaluation: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluators Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluators Signatures: \_\_\_\_\_

**Instructions:** Each of the criteria should be rated on a scale of 1 – 5 (each having a corresponding score or point value). Refer to the RFP for details pertaining to each section. Comments may be written that lend insight on why points were awarded or failed to be awarded for a particular criteria. Enter the score in each section. Add the Total Scores for the Final Score.

**The descriptions of the ratings (1 through 5) are listed below:**

**5 = Excellent**

- Fully meets all requirements and exceeds several requirements.
- Proposal exceeds minimum requirements, specifications and provisions in most aspects for the specific criteria.
- Excellent understanding of the project that demonstrates in-depth comprehension of the project.
- No risk of unacceptable or late performance. State involvement likely will not exceed normal contract administration.

**4 = Good**

- Proposal more than adequately meets the minimum requirements, specifications or provisions of the specific criteria, and exceeds those requirements in some aspects for the specific criteria.
- Proposal exceeds requirements in a way that benefits the State or meets the requirements and contains enhancing features, which benefit the States.
- Low risk of unacceptable or late performance. State involvement not likely to exceed normal contract administration or require frequent guidance.

**3 = Adequate**

- Proposal adequately meets the minimum requirements, specifications, or provisions of the specific item, and is generally capable of meeting the Consortium State's needs for specific criteria.
- Proposal demonstrates basic understanding of the requirement that is likely adequate for successful performance, but proposal does not demonstrate more than surface comprehension.
- Moderate risk of unacceptable or late performance, likely could require occasional State involvement to achieve successful completion on-time.

**2 = Marginal**

- Proposal minimally addresses the requirements, but one or more major considerations of the component are not addressed, or so limited that it results in a low degree of confidence in the proposer's response or proposed solution.
- Proposal meets many of the basic requirements, specifications, or provisions of the specific item, but is lacking in some essential aspects for the specific criteria.
- High risk of unacceptable or late performance, likely would require extensive State involvement to achieve successful completion.

**1 = Unsatisfactory**

- Not addressed or response provided is of no value.
- Proposal is inadequate in most basic requirements, specifications, or provisions for the specific criteria.
- Proposal does not comply substantially with requirements.

CRITERIA & PERTINENT REQUIREMENT SECTIONS	SCORE
<p>6.1.2 <b>Specialized expertise, capabilities, and technical competence as demonstrated by the proposed approach and methodology to meet the project requirements</b> – RFP § 3.3, 3.4, 4.2, &amp; 4.6 Assigned Score: 1 = 0, 2 = 25, 3 = 50, 4 = 75, &amp; 5 = 100 (Maximum Score = 100 points)</p> <p><i>Reviewer Comments/Notes:</i></p>	
<p>6.1.3 <b>Resources available to perform the work, including any specialized services, within the specified time limits for the project, taking into consideration but not limited to the proposed workforce plan (Maximum Score = 10 points)</b> – RFP §§ 3.8, 4.3, 4.14, 4.15, &amp; 4.17 Assigned Score: 1 = 0, 2 = 25, 3 = 50, 4 = 75, &amp; 5 = 100 (Maximum Score = 100 points)</p> <p><i>Reviewer Comments/Notes:</i></p>	
<p>6.1.4 <b>Record of past performance, including price and cost data from previous projects, quality of work, ability to meet schedules, cost control, and contract administration</b> – RFP § 3.8, 4.9, 4.11, &amp; 4.12 Assigned Score: 1 = 0, 2 = 25, 3 = 50, 4 = 75, &amp; 5 = 100 (Maximum Score = 100 points)</p> <p><i>Reviewer Comments/Notes:</i></p>	
<p>6.1.5 <b>Availability to the project locale</b> – RFP § 4.4, 4.5 Assigned Score: 1 = 0, 2 = 25, 3 = 50, 4 = 75, &amp; 5 = 100 (Maximum Score = 100 points)</p>	

	<i>Reviewer Comments/Notes:</i>	
6.1.6	<p><b>Familiarity with the project locale – RFP § 4.6</b> Assigned Score: 1 = 0, 2 = 15, 3 = 30, 4 = 45, &amp; 5 = 60 <b>(Maximum Score = 60 points)</b></p> <p><i>Reviewer Comments/Notes:</i></p>	
6.1.7	<p><b>Proposed project management techniques – RFP § 4.6 &amp; 4.17</b> Assigned Score: 1 = 0, 2 = 15, 3 = 30, 4 = 45, &amp; 5 = 60 <b>(Maximum Score = 60 points)</b></p> <p><i>Reviewer Comments/Notes:</i></p>	
6.1.8	<p><b>Ability and proven history in handling special project constraints – RFP §§ 4.18 (see also ARSD 44:72:02:01)</b> Assigned Score: 1 = 0, 2 = 15, 3 = 30, 4 = 45, &amp; 5 = 60 <b>(Maximum Score = 60 points)</b></p> <p><i>Reviewer Comments/Notes:</i></p>	

- 
- 
- 
- **TOTAL SCORE (Max Score = 580 points) \_\_\_\_\_**